

NEW YORK: 45 Broadway 19th Floor New York, NY 10006 T 212.221.6900 F 212.221.6989

mellen.s@wssllp.com

August 23, 2013

## **VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL**

Hon. Lorna G. Schofield United States District Judge United States Courthouse 40 Foley Square New York, NY 10007

| U | SDC SDNY |            |       |
|---|----------|------------|-------|
| D | OCUMENT  | 7          |       |
| E | LECTRON  | ICALLY     | FILED |
| D | OC #:    |            |       |
| D | ATE FILE | ): 8/23/13 |       |

Re: Index No. 1:13-CV-02975 (LGS) Sachin Shah v. Justin Lumiere, et al.

Dear Judge Schofield:

This office represents defendant Justin Lumiere in connection with the captioned matter. We write in regards to the letter motion submitted by plaintiff's counsel on August 21, 2013, seeking leave to withdraw in this matter, and Your Honor's endorsed order of August 22, 2013 granting that motion.

We do not, of course, oppose counsel's request to withdraw. However, we write to seek reconsideration of Your Honor's order to the extent it granted an extension of only the discovery cutoff and plaintiff's time to serve Stefan Lumiere, while leaving all other deadlines in place, including next Friday's deadline for the defendants to answer or move in response to the Complaint.

As Your Honor is aware from the letter previously submitted by defendant Levy's counsel on August 8, 2013, the parties have been engaged in discussions since the inception of this matter to determine if a voluntary resolution is possible. Our client, who has denied under oath any involvement with the anonymous emails that are the subject of the Complaint, is hopeful that plaintiff may agree to a stay or a dismissal without prejudice of the claims against him. However, the sudden and completely unexpected decision by plaintiff to terminate his counsel has short-circuited the parties' ongoing discussions, and has left Mr. Lumiere in a position where he must now incur the significant burden and expense associated with responding to the Complaint because there is no longer any attorney for his counsel to talk to.

Hon. Lorna G. Schofield August 23, 2013 Page 2

While plaintiff certainly has the right to engage counsel of his choosing, it seems unfair that the burden of his decision to change horses in mid-stream should fall entirely upon the defendants, given their good-faith efforts to work towards a resolution of this dispute and to avoid burdening the Court. With the utmost respect for this Court's efforts to efficiently manage its docket, we ask that Your Honor respectfully reconsider the August 22, 2013 endorsed order and grant Mr. Lumiere a 30-day extension of his time to respond to the Complaint until September 30, 2013, to correspond with the 30-day extension granted in that order for the dates which affect the plaintiff.

We have spoken with counsel for defendant Levy, Lawrence P. Eagel, Esq., who asked that we convey his request for a similar 30-day extension as to Mr. Levy, in hopes that continued discussions with plaintiff's new counsel may prove fruitful. We are pleased to respectfully convey that request to Your Honor's attention.

Because plaintiff's counsel has been relieved by the Court, this letter is copied directly to the plaintiff, Sachin Shah. We ask that Mr. Shah provide the parties as soon as possible with contact information for his new attorneys, so that future communications may be directed to their attention.

We greatly appreciate the Court's attention to this matter.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/

Steven E. Mellen [SM-7368]

cc: Mr. Sachin Shah (via electronic mail)
Lawrence P. Eagel, Esq. (via electronic mail)
Robert N. Knuts, Esq. (via electronic mail)

Michael Schwarzberg, Esq.

The deadline to answer or otherwise respond to the Complaint for Defendants Justin Lumiere and Lester Levy is extended to September 30th, 2013.

August 23, 2013 New York, NY

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE